



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,616	07/13/2001	Wojciech K. Slusarek	81080ACPK	2990

7590 06/28/2006

Sarah Meeks Roberts
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

BARTS, SAMUEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1621

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The added language, **“wherein the compound comprises only a single blocked developing agent”**, is not found verbatim in the specification. Moreover, the specification fails to support that applicant had generally conceived this particular limitation at the time of filing this application. Applicant is required to remove this limitation.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation **“wherein the compound comprises only a single blocked developing agent”** is indefinite in that it fails to clearly delineate the metes and bound of the claim. The public would not be adequately apprised of the scope of compounds, which they would be excluded from using. Applicant is required to clearly point out the metes and bound of their invention. A broad generic Markush-Type claim with numerous variables is generally

Art Unit: 1621

limited by amended the language that defines each variable. In this way, the breath of the claim would be clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.


6. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Irving et al (US 6,242,166)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Irving et al disclosed the following compound¹:

¹ See column 35 compound labeled D-16.

Art Unit: 1621



The compound is embraced by the claimed genus².

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Irving et al (US 6,242,166)

9. The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of

² Please note that the examiner has ignored the phrase "wherein the compound comprises only a single blocked developing agent". The phrase is not supported and is unclear as pointed out in the 112 rejections of record.

Art Unit: 1621

invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

For reasons see previous office action

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The added language is not supported and is unclear. See rejections above. Applicant's argument that Irving et al fail to teach a tetrahedral carbon is not found persuasive. A tetrahedral carbon is a carbon that forms four bonds to other atoms. Note that the species pointed to in the 102(e) rejection has four bonds on the carbon atom.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel A. Barts whose telephone number is 571-272-2870. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

Art Unit: 1621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Samuel A Barts
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1621

SB